RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 1 1 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 10, 11, 19, and 22-36 remain pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and the pending claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 19, 31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant in this reply is amending claims 1, 19, 31, and 33, and therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the section 112 rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3-5, 10, 19, 22, 24-25, 27-28, 31, 33, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0025245 to Flickinger et al. ("Flickinger"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As understood by applicant, Flickinger discloses an automatic asset registration process that uses an electronic file called an E-registrar. The electronic file, which can be stored on a hard drive or in a smart card, for example, contains data specific to the purchaser (Flickinger, par. 0020, 0021, 0023). Each prospective purchaser would have his or her own E-Registrar (Flickinger, par. 0035). The purchaser registers an asset by activating this electronic file. When the E-registrar is activated, the purchaser-specific data is sent from the seller to a registration database (Flickinger, par. 0023). Flickinger also discloses a variety of ways in which the E-registrar can be activated (see Flickinger, par. 0024). The technique allows automatic registration of a product or service (par. 0033). Flickinger appears to teaches that the product registration is completed once the E-registrar information is provided to the on-line retailer or

PAGE 16/20 * RCVD AT 9/11/2006 3:56:06 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5167424366 * DURATION (mm-ss):06-42

credit card company. E-registrar or a separate electronic file is crucial for the workings of Flickinger.

On the other hand, the present application and the claims are directed to automating product registration, for example, in which the information obtained from a purchaser at the time of the sale is also used to register a purchased item, for instance, with a manufacturer. The information is, for instance, presented on a web page so that the purchaser need not duplicate the effort of entering the similar information when registering the item. Rather, the information is presented to the purchaser to verify and update, if needed.

Accordingly, while Flickinger appears to disclose automatic registration of products by activating its E-registrar, Flickinger does not disclose or suggest every element claimed in independent claims 1, 19, 31, and 33. For example, Flickinger fails to disclose or suggest at least "generating at least one web page using said product registration information and said customer information transmitted to the server of said manufacturer at the time the customer purchases said one or more products to allow the customer to verify and update said product registration information and said customer information" as claimed in claims 1 and 31; and "the server associated with the manufacturer allows the customer to verify and update said product registration information and said customer information" as claimed in claims 19 and 33.

The Office Action cites Flickinger's paragraph 0005 as allegedly disclosing that element. That section, however, does not disclose "generating at least one web page using said product registration information and said customer information." Rather, paragraph 0005 of Flickinger describes disadvantages of prior art method in which the purchaser must complete and submit a data input form. Flickinger provides that an example of a data input form is a web browser window, on which a purchaser must manually repeat the input process by filling out the form.

PAGE 17/20 * RCVD AT 9/11/2006 3:56:06 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5167424366 * DURATION (mm-ss):08-42

For at least the foregoing reason, applicant believes Flickinger does not disclose or suggest every element claimed in independent claims 1, 19, 31, and 33 and their dependent claims by virtue of their dependencies.

While the above reason suffices to overcome Flickinger, Flickinger also does not disclose or suggest "completing a product registration of said one or more products when the customer verifies and updates said product registration information and said customer information" as claimed in claims 1 and 31, and "the server associated with the manufacturer completes a product registration of said one or more products when the customer verifies and updates said product registration information and said customer information" claimed in claims 19 and 33. The Office Action cites Flickinger's paragraphs 0006, 0036 and 0038 as allegedly disclosing that element. Contrarily, however, those paragraphs do not disclose or suggest completing product registration when the customer verifies and updates information. Rather, as understood by applicant, paragraphs 0036 and 0038 suggest that after automatic registration, verification to confirm the registration is provided to the purchaser. Thus, according to paragraphs 0036 and 0038, Flickinger's verification is to confirm the registration after the fact. Flickenger does not appear to provide an opportunity for the customer to verify or update the product registration information and the customer information before completing the registration. This feature is useful, for example, if there are errors in or updates to the presented information, or if a particular product was purchased as a gift and the information need to be changed to reflect the gift recipient's data for that particular product registration.

The Office Action in "Response to Amendment and Arguments" counters that Flickinger allows for updates and changes to the individual's E-registrar, citing Flickinger's paragraph 0021. Allowing an individual to update his or her own E-registrar is different from presenting

PAGE 18/20 * RCVD AT 9/11/2006 3:56:06 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5167424366 * DURATION (mm-ss):06-42

product registration information and allowing modification of product registration information and customer information for registering a particular product. For instance, updating Flickinger's E-registrar changes the specific data associated with a purchaser, which data then would be used for all purchase transactions and product registrations thereafter. On the other hand, claims 1, 19, 31 and 33 recite allowing " the customer to verify and update said product registration information and said customer information."

Therefore, for at least this additional reason, it is believed that Flickenger does not disclose or suggest every element claimed in independent claims 1, 19, 31, and 33 and their respective dependent claims by virtue of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 11, 29-30, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Flickinger in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0034609 to Dovolis ("Dovolis"). Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Flickinger in view of U.S. Patent 6,069,941 to Byrd et al. ("Byrd").

Claims 11, 29-30 and 32 are dependent claims. Therefore, the same reason provided for independent claims 1, 19, 31 and 33 to distinguish Flickinger applies to claims 11, 29-30 and 32. Further, because Dovolis fails to disclose or suggest what Flickinger lacks, it is believed that Flickinger and Dovolis, taken alone or in combination, do not render claims 11, 29-30 and 32 obvious.

Similarly, claim 26 depends from claim 19. As in discussion of claim 19 above, Flickinger does not disclose, suggest or teach every element claimed independent claim 19. In

PAGE 19/20 * RCVD AT 9/11/2006 3:56:06 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5167424366 * DURATION (mm-ss):06-42

addition, because Byrd fails to disclose or suggest what Flickinger lacks, applicant believes that Flickinger and Byrd, taken alone or in combination, do not render claim 26 obvious.

This communication is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and every effort has been made to place the application in condition for allowance. A favorable Office Action is hereby earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner call applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Fischman

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

SF:EP:me

PAGE 20/20 * RCVD AT 9/11/2006 3:56:06 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5167424366 * DURATION (mm-ss):06-42